# UNITY

*FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION*


Hampton Institute—Light in Virginia - - - - - - - *Nicholas Solomon*

Are We Becoming Less Humane? - - - - - - - *Frederic James Dennis*

Harlan Coal Miner - - - *Don West*

The Law, the Treaties, and the Wars! - - - - - - *Brent Dow Allinson*

Green Old Age - - - *R. S. Kellerman*



VOLUME CXX NUMBER 3

Chicago, October 4, 1937

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

# UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

*Published Semi-Monthly* *Subscription $3.00*
*Until Further Notice* *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

*"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."*

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*



*Board of Directors*

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

*Editorial Contributors*

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

*Poetry Editors*

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

*Foreign Representatives*

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH


## Contents


EDITORIAL—

Notes ..... 35
Jottings—J. H. H. ..... 37

ARTICLES—

Hampton Institute—Light in Virginia—NICHOLAS SOLOMON .... 38
Are We Becoming Less Humane?—FREDERIC JAMES DENNIS .... 41
Harlan Coal Miner—DON WEST ..... 42
The Law, the Treaties, and the Wars!—BRENT DOW ALLINSON .. 44
Green Old Age—R. S. KELLERMAN ..... 46

THE STUDY TABLE—

Dictators Old and New / A Question of Taste } JOHN HAYNES HOLMES ..... 47

CORRESPONDENCE—

John Brown—V. FRIEDERIKA VAN BUSKIRK ..... 48
The War in Asia—SYDNEY STRONG ..... 48

THE FIELD—

How the German Child Learns Arithmetic—*Nofrontier News Service* ..... 34


## The Field

***"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."***

### How the German Child Learns Arithmetic

A new German textbook in mathematics for elementary schools shows how the German child is being militarized. Here are a few examples:

One of our bombing planes flies 280 km. per hour in daytime and 240 km. per hour at night. How long would it take to cover the distances between Berlin and Prague? between Munich and Strasbourg? between Cologne and Metz?

A squadron of 46 bombing planes is dropping bombs on an enemy city. Each plane carries 500 bombs weighing 1½ kilo each. What is the total weight of the bombs? How many fires will be set if every third bomb is a hit?

In the World War the Germanic allies mobilized 11,000,000 men, while Germany herself mobilized 13,000,000. Germany's enemies mobilized 47,000,000 men. How many enemies did each ten soldiers of Germany and her allies face on the front?

The World War lasted 1,563 days. How many German soldiers gave their lives for the Fatherland every day? every hour? every minute?

France with a population of 42,000,000 spent 10,500,000,000 francs for armed preparedness in 1934. Germany with a population of 66,000,000 spent 650,000,000 marks during the same period. How much was spent for preparedness per person in France? in Germany?

On March 16, 1935, Germany had 100,000 soldiers for the protection of a frontier 2,700 km. long. France had 600,000 soldiers for a frontier 2,700 km. long. How many soldiers were there per frontier kilometer in France? in Germany? How many soldiers ought Germany to have in proportion to France?—*Nofrontier News Service.*

# UNITY

*"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"*

Volume CXX MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1937 No. 3

## TEN COMMANDMENTS FOR CHURCH ATTENDANTS*

**I**
**Thou shalt not come to service late,**
**Nor for the Amen refuse to wait.**

**II**
**Thy noisy tongue thou shalt restrain**
**When speaks the organ its refrain.**

**III**
**But when the hymns are sounded out,**
**Thou shalt lift up thy voice and shout.**

**IV**
**The endmost seat thou shalt leave free,**
**For more must share the pew with thee.**

**V**
**The offering-plate thou shalt not fear,**
**But give thine uttermost with cheer.**

**VI**
**Thou shalt this calendar peruse,**
**And look here for the church's news.**

**VII**
**Thou shalt the minister give heed,**
**Nor blame him when thou'rt disagreed.**

**VIII**
**Unto thy neighbor thou shalt bend,**
**And if a stranger, make a friend.**

**IX**
**Thou shalt in every way be kind,**
**Compassionate, of tender mind.**

**X**
**And so, by all thy spirit's grace,**
**Thou shalt show God within this place.**

*John Haynes Holmes.*

---

## KEEP US OUT OF WAR!

President Roosevelt's pledge to do his utmost to keep this nation out of war has the united and grateful support of the entire country. No voice of dissent has been raised, or will be raised. We remember 1917 and want no more of it! As to how the President may best keep his pledge, however, there will inevitably be differences of opinion. Not to do what we did in 1914-17 would seem to be one sure answer. But a resolve of inaction is oftentimes as difficult to carry out as a resolve of action. The Neutrality Act is a case in point. Should the President put this Act into force in the matter of China, or should he follow his present policy of leaving the Act in a state of indefinite suspension? On the face of things we agree with Dr. Frederick Libby, of the National Council for the Prevention of War—that the Neutrality Act should be put vigorously into effect, since the war in China, declared or not, is a real war, and therefore just the kind of occasion contemplated by those who prepared the legislation. But we are not so sure as we were in our last issue that the President and Secretary Hull do not know far more about the situation than we do, and that therefore they may be entirely justified in postponing any declaration of neutrality which might well aggravate the situation and thus greatly imperil our own position. Nothing can be more terrible, and also dangerous, than the present crisis in Asia and Europe alike. We know no wiser policy on the part of the people than to insist that there be no war so far as America is concerned, to bind the administration fast to its pledge of peace, and then to trust the administration, as sincere in its high purpose, to find the way of safety. Also, there remains always the basic resolve that whatever the government may in the end do, there will be no war so far as we are concerned as individuals. Mr. President, *we will not fight!*

## TOO SMART!

One of President Roosevelt's least engaging qualities is his smartness. He is always ready to out-smart an opponent, and usually succeeds. But smartness is dangerous; like a boomerang, it not infrequently turns back and smites the man who uses it. A case in point was the President's Supreme Court measure. This was clever, shrewd, smart—no doubt about that! Within twenty-four hours of its announcement, the liberal New York *World-Telegram,* friendly to Mr. Roosevelt through all his public life and an ardent supporter of his first administration, announced its opposition to the bill by saying that it was "too d—d smart." This conviction slowly but surely grew upon the country, and at last made the passage of the bill impossible. Mr. Roosevelt had outdone himself by his own cleverness. Another example of this same truth is now before us in the case of Senator Black, recently raised to the Supreme Bench to succeed Mr. Justice Van Devanter. The appointment of Senator Black was the

*Republished in answer to requests.—EDITOR.

smartest possible kind of move. The President wanted, and rightly wanted, a thoroughly liberal judge who could be counted upon to have an open mind toward the progressive legislation of the administration. Men qualified as liberals, and also by learning and experience as jurists, were not few. But the Senate was in revolt, and the conservative Democratic Senators of the South ready and eager to smite the White House. So what could be more clever than to appoint a Senator, and a Senator from the South, and thus outwit a body which had been clamoring only a few weeks before for the appointment of the late Senator Robinson? Nothing could be smarter—and the Senator from Alabama was given the appointment, to the vast confusion of the President's enemies. But now these enemies are again triumphant, and Mr. Roosevelt is in deeper trouble than at any time since he was elected. For here are all these alleged disclosures that the new judge is a Ku Klux Klanner, and, by silence or by outright denial of the charge when originally made, deceived us all. From the beginning there has seemed to be a curse resting upon everything connected with Mr. Roosevelt's attack upon the Court. Its curse is its smartness. Let the President on this issue rise to the sober dignity of the statesmanship of which he is capable, and his troubles will be over!

## RUSSIA AND ITALY IN SPAIN

The real character of the Spanish civil war as a struggle between Russia and Italy, Communism and Fascism, for the mastery of a prostrate and bleeding country, was convincingly revealed when the "piratical" submarine blockade was at its height in the Mediterranean. The New York *Times* correspondent on the Loyalist side, Mr. Herbert Matthews, gave the whole situation away when he sent a feverish despatch declaring "the continuance of the . . . blockade would doom the Valencia government." Already, he went on to say, "the supply of Russian material to Spain has been virtually stopped," and "Spain cannot get along without Russian supplies." This confession balances the picture perfectly. The help given to the Insurgents by Italy, and also by Germany, is not only known but proudly boasted. General Franco has thousands of crack Italian troops in his armies; he has hundreds of Italian tanks and machine-guns, as well as all the German bombing-planes he can use. The victories of the Rebels are celebrated in Rome as Italian victories. Without Italian and, in a lesser measure, German aid, the Insurgent cause would collapse in a month from sheer lack of the men, material, and also money for war. Help given to the other side, the Loyalists, has not been so well known. It has not been to the advantage of the propagandists to present this fact. Rather has the world been given to understand that the Spaniards, risen with one accord against their enemies, have been fighting their own battles with their own men and munitions. As a matter of fact, this is true to an extent altogether unknown among the Rebels. But the gasoline, the raw materials, the aeroplanes indispensable to Loyalist warfare, the Russians have provided—and would have provided men had they been needed. In other words, what began as a barracks revolt in Spain was straightway taken over by Fascists and Communists in their own interests. A European war is now being fought out on Spanish soil. We may like or excuse this on one side or the other, but in either case, let's be frank about it. Let's not sentimentalize into a struggle between Spaniards for Spanish democracy what is in reality a struggle between aliens for European supremacy. Our own one concern in Spain is for the stricken people, who want the war to end.

## "A CHRONIC EMERGENCY"

UNITY has been content to say little in recent years about the liquor situation. We knew that the liquor situation would speak for itself in due course and in no uncertain terms. Evidence that Repeal was going to mean something like disaster began to accumulate within a few months after Prohibition was gone, and steadily week after week the evidence has been piling up. Now comes something like a final judgment in the report published this month by two Harvard Medical School researchers in the *New England Journal of Medicine*. These researchers have carried on their investigations over a long period of time, basing their study on 50,000 alcoholic cases admitted to the Boston City Hospital since 1864. They take pains to state that their conclusions are in no way peculiar to Boston but are characteristic of the entire country. They point out that alcoholism mounted during Prohibition as opposition to law enforcement became increasingly successful, but *has increased at an alarming rate since Repeal.* What the facts under their scrutiny reveal is the following:

> *Alcoholics* account for one-twentieth of all admissions to hospitals, forming one of the largest groups demanding care.
>
> *Deaths* from alcoholism are increasing out of proportion to the increase in alcoholic admissions.
>
> *In the years following repeal of Prohibition,* the annual deaths from alcoholism doubled.

What all this indicates, says the report, is that alcoholism has now become in this country *"a great chronic emergency."* In the end, of course, the "emergency" will become so critical that there will be a sweep back into Prohibition. The liquor fight has always moved in cycles, and the cycle back from "wet" to "dry" should come in about twenty-five years or less. Whether this return to Prohibition will endure is questionable—the booze crowd is rich and powerful, and can corrupt politicians as easily as they can buy news-

papers. There will probably be another swing to Repeal in due course. But the battle against this evil, like the old battle against slavery, will be victorious, and there will come the time when the liquor trade will be as dead as the slave trade.

### JULIA WARD HOWE'S HYMN

We read in the *Christian Century* that the United Daughters of the Confederacy are waging a campaign to remove Julia Ward Howe's "Battle Hymn of the Republic" from the hymnals of the nation's churches. The objection offered is that "it is essentially a war song." With this judgment we agree—we have not used the hymn for church services in many years! But we wonder if the Daughters in question are opposing other well-known hymns on the same ground. Would they purge the hymnals of "Onward, Christian Soldiers," the imagery and spirit of which are hopelessly militaristic? What about "The Son of God Goes Forth to War"—would they banish this dreadful song from public worship? If so, we have heard nothing of any campaign analogous to the one directed against Mrs. Howe's famous poem. With all due respect to the Confederacy ladies, we have a suspicion that they are using a reason of wide sympathetic appeal to mask a much more specific reason which is in their minds. They are trying to get rid of the "Battle Hymn of the Republic" because it perpetuates the memory of the Civil War—its defeats, disasters, and despairs. In a war fought by the South for an ignoble cause, this "Battle Hymn" was a potent force for victory in the camps of the foe. It also sets forth with peculiar power the ideals that moved the soul of the embattled North. Why are not the Daughters honest in saying just what they mean and want? We say this with the greater emphasis since we would join them, on the basis of this true reason, in seeking a purge of the hymnals. We object to the "Battle Hymn" not only because it is a battle hymn, but also because it celebrates a tragic and not a glorious episode in our nation's history—the division that rent the union of our states and dyed our soil with fratricidal blood. Our hymnbooks should carry no memorials of such a struggle. Julia Ward Howe's poem has its place in the history of the country, where as a fact it can no more be forgotten than *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. It has its permanent place in our literature as a poem of poignant power and beauty. But it has no place in the hymnody of religion. We would no more use it in song than we would read the war-Psalms in scripture.

### A GREAT PREACHER AND THEOLOGIAN

Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, dead on September 12th last, was one of the greatest intellectual and spiritual forces in the church of his day. A leader of power and dignity, he made not the slightest concession to popular fancies and fashions, but moved austerely on his own high levels and invited people to follow—if they could! That many *did* follow in the years of Dr. Jefferson's preaching and the glare and noise of Broadway's business and amusement life in New York City is a testimony alike to the innate worth of mankind and to the inescapable appeal of the preacher's message. It was deep responding unto deep, with the result that, for a generation, the Broadway Tabernacle was one of the few most vital witnesses in this country to the everlasting reality of religion. Dr. Jefferson preached sober and severe sermons; he expounded Biblical and theological themes without apology; he exacted close attention and hard thinking from his congregations, and he got both. His church was his empire as his pulpit was his throne. He labored steadfastly in his parish, leaving far-flung public lecturing, social reform activity, political and civic campaigns to others. This does not mean that he was indifferent to the exactions of applied Christianity—only that he was convinced that such Christianity must have its beginning in the single soul and thus grow and spread from the devoted individual life. One great public cause, however, enlisted his direct and untiring support. This was the cause of international peace, which found in Dr. Jefferson a leader of prophetic passion, courage, and idealism. Dr. Jefferson may best be described, perhaps, as one of the last survivors of the school of Phillips Brooks and George A. Gordon. A changed world has brought a changed church. A different type of religious leadership now holds the stage. But there was an austerity, a single-minded consecration, a learning, and an unworldly service in these men of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries which now we miss. That spiritual teachers today, unlike those of yesterday, are so "careful and troubled about many things" instead of being absorbed in the "one thing needful" is perhaps one more evidence of the degeneracy of our times.

---

## Jottings

"Jottings" has enjoyed a restful and refreshing vacation, and returns with greetings to its readers. Lay on, Macduff, and let the quips fall where they may!

---

"Scrap iron" is well named. Follow any of the many ships loaded in our ports with nuts, bolts, plates, old automobiles, and other iron, and see them headed straight for the scrap in China!

---

The Japanese have justified, or attempted to justify, their latest war on China on the ground that the Chinese have shown themselves "unfriendly" to the

Japanese. Recent events, we suppose, are directed toward making the Chinese more friendly!

---

The Planetarium in New York City has been staging a special exhibition of the "End of the World." It should be explained that this is a depiction of an astronomical cataclysm some hundreds of millions of years hence, and not of current events in Europe and Asia.

---

The late President Masaryk, of Czecho-Slovakia, was rightly described as the George Washington of his country. Humanity is not wholly lost, nor an age wholly bad, when a second George Washington can thus appear among us.

---

"What's in a name?"—Alas, and alas—how oftentimes how much! In all the vast wilderness of human cognomens, what one could so perfectly fit the new appointee to the Supreme Court as *Black?*

J. H. H.

---

# Hampton Institute—Light in Virginia

NICHOLAS SOLOMON

Riding through Norfolk, Virginia, several months ago, I saw three men take seats near the back of the street car in which I was sitting. Two were young and carried handbags, apparently out-of-town visitors to their somewhat older companion. There were no seats together, so each had to take a seat next to another person. One of the young men took the nearest aisle seat to the others. There happened to be a young colored woman sitting in the same seat. The older man, noticing this, reached across and touched his companion, and unobtrusively but urgently motioned him to take another seat. The young man did not seem to understand at first, but finally complied.

During the next couple of weeks, walking among colored students, sitting with them in chapel, stepping inside the homes of colored teachers and talking for a short while, sitting among students and parents in a colored school watching a school play, having a little colored girl of six sit across the table from me at dinner—these and other comparatively brief contacts in themselves gave me an odd feeling. This was the South, where I, a Northerner, had always been told that whites simply did not associate with colored in any semblance of equality. To do the things which I knew were largely socially taboo—that in itself was exciting.

But stronger than that feeling was one of embarrassment akin to shame, mingled with humility and gratitude, that I, a white person, should be so pleasantly and cordially treated by members of a race who have many causes to blame and few to praise what my color stands for.

Perhaps the greatest argument advanced by whites for "keeping the Negro in his place" is the claim that the race is definitely inferior. Those who have studied the problem know that after much careful and scientific research, this claim has been proved baseless. The only truth that can be upheld is that at present their *mass* achievements culturally, economically and intellectually have not placed them on a par with the whites. But the advance from the time they were ignorant slaves, less than 75 years ago, up to the present is phenomenal.

The most important factor in this advance has, I believe, been the Negro schools and colleges; and of these, Hampton Institute was the first, the parent of others, and by far the most outstanding, although in more recent years some of its newer brothers and sisters have grown to share its fame.

Hampton was erected in a section of the country that fairly reeks with historical significance. Nearby is Jamestown, where the first white settlers landed in America. Yorktown of Revolutionary fame and Fortress Monroe of Civil War prominence are in the vicinity, and, more relevant to the Negro situation, the first cargo of slaves was sold not far from where Hampton now stands.

The founder of Hampton, who is responsible for many of its important principles, was General Samuel Chapman Armstrong, born in Hawaii of missionary parents, who became interested in the Negro problem through his contacts with Negro soldiers during the Civil War. To quote from his writings:

> "Two and a half years' service as lieutenant colonel and colonel of the Eighth and Ninth Regiments of the United States Colored Troops convinced me that the freedmen had excellent qualities and capacities and deserved as good a chance as any people. Educational methods to meet their needs must include special practical training and take into account the forces of heredity and environment. A dream of the Hampton school, nearly as it is, came to me a few times during the War—an industrial system, not only for the sake of self-support and intelligent labor, but also for the sake of character. And it seemed equally clear that the people of the country would support a wise work for the freedmen. I think so yet."

In 1868, General Armstrong persuaded the American Missionary Association to open the school on property on which was located a soldiers' hospital during the Civil War, the hospital barracks being converted into temporary school buildings. (Hampton was granted a charter in 1870 and became independent of any organization.) General Armstrong was put in charge with a staff of two teachers and fifteen ex-slaves as his student body.

The change in the status of the school from that of almost entirely an elementary school to an almost entirely collegiate institution may well mark a parallel to the advance of Negro education in general in the South. As late as 1918, almost the entire student body was of elementary and secondary grade. Today the enrollment is over 1,000, nearly all students being of collegiate grade, due to rapid increase of high schools and to the necessity for meeting higher requirements for teachers in the South.

Hampton, unlike other schools and colleges, has placed greatest emphasis from the very beginning on what the founder termed "education for life." The training of the whole student, his character, his

mind and his hands at the same time, has been and is the basis of Hampton's activity. Work for the students has been the practice since the school's inception, to enable the students to earn their schooling, to train them in efficient and scientific methods of work, but above all to build character. In Armstrong's words, "In all men, education is conditioned, not alone on an enlightened head and a changed heart, but very largely on a routine of industrious habits, which is to character what the foundation is to the pyramid."

The main training at Hampton has been and still is the training of teachers, teachers of trades and tradesmen. The largest proportion of graduates are teachers, and from the school's beginning the demand for them has always been great. Even in the last two years placement in teaching and trades combined was 93 per cent.

The different schools are agriculture, business, education, home economics, library, music, nursing, and the trade school, in which are given courses in automobile mechanics, bricklaying, plastering, cabinet making, carpentry, electrical work, forging and welding, upholstering, machinists trade, painting, sheet metal work, steamfitting, plumbing, and tailoring. And most students get experience in their fields of study. Teachers train in an adjoining model grade and high school. Every job that student labor can take care of is performed by them. They even build and repair their own school buildings.

It is interesting to compare the expenses of a student at Hampton with those that are known to obtain at most of our northern colleges and universities. The student is charged $20 per month for room, board, and laundry. The college tuition is $150 per year, and a scholarship of $100 is granted to each new student. At the end of each year, students who have maintained a "B" average or better are awarded a full scholarship for the next year, those with "C" $100, those who have advanced a year in standing but have not a "C" average $75, and even those who remain a second year in the same grade receive $50.

Then there is the arrangement known as the work-year, by means of which a student, paying a total of $70 during the year, is enabled to work six to eight hours a day for twelve months, taking classes for two hours a day for nine months. He is thus enabled to pay his expenses for that year and save enough, "by strictest economy," to pay living expenses for the next year.

This low-cost schooling is essential in view of the present economic condition of most Negroes, and is made possible through endowments and gifts by white and colored friends of the school. It is both fortunate and at the same time unfortunate that the president is required to spend much of his time traveling in a campaign to raise funds to enable the work to continue, fortunate in that this spreads information and knowledge about Hampton and colored activities to far places, unfortunate in that it deprives the school of the undivided attention of its head.

The activities of the Extension Department of Hampton, as mentioned by President Howe in his 1936 annual report, "are so varied and far-reaching that imagination must be exercised to adequately appreciate the good done in the brief references here made to a few outstanding features.

"The campaign for beautification of homes and schools has continued. From the first four local garden clubs started four years ago, the number has increased to forty clubs in Virginia and to twenty in North Carolina. The movement has been greatly helped by members of white garden clubs and has had an accordingly significant interracial aspect.

"The Negro Organization Society, started years ago by Dr. Robert R. Moton, and which is still making use of this Department, received from the State of Virginia an appropriation of $1,500. This aid from the State was public recognition of the Better Farms, Better Health, Better Schools, Better Homes program of this organization.

"Mr. Wm. M. Cooper, Secretary of Extension, has received 199 applications for the Armstrong Gardens Federal Homestead Project. This project is directed by federal officials of the Resettlement Division of the U. S. Department of Agriculture. The government is contemplating the erection of 200 homes. Mr. Cooper serves as Secretary of the Sponsoring Committee and your President is the Sponsor. The Institute is interested because it will afford educational opportunities for students in the programs of home-making, health, gardens, etc., of the prospective homesteaders.

"The Department continues to serve rural grade and county high schools in securing books, transportation, equipment and buildings. Miss Eva C. Mitchell, the Assistant Secretary, has done significant work in improving teaching in the schools through her extension classes for teachers.

"Mr. Cooper, at the request of the State, has directed the State Adult Education program for Eastern Virginia. He is now supervising a Statewide study of Vocational Education of Negroes for the Federal Commission of the U. S. Department of the Interior."

Hampton is one of the first schools to keep definite and extensive records of the graduates. Careful check of each graduate is kept. He writes the school a letter each Christmas telling of his activities and work. Through these records the school is enabled to make placements, assist the graduates in many ways, and learn what effect their schooling has on their surroundings. Through these records, for instance, one discovers to what extent agricultural graduates, as county agents, have assisted the farmers, and how the home economics teachers, beyond their teaching work, have helped housewives to brighten their lives.

Religious activities at the college include compulsory attendance at church, chapel six days a week, and voluntary Y. W. C. A. and Y. M. C. A. participation. I visited a joint meeting of the two last-named groups one Sunday evening and found it extremely well attended. There is evidence that much greater emphasis is placed on religious and moral questions there than at other schools and colleges which I have known.

There is also much evidence that religion enters into the life and work of the students. The spirit of service is what might properly be termed the Hampton spirit, for the school believes, in the words of its president, Arthur Howe, that it is "more important to send out a good citizen with a vision than a self-supporting one." Students go out into key positions, realizing that it is largely their

responsibility to raise the existence level of the Negro masses. And so far, Hampton can claim a great deal of credit for raising the level of the home life and health of the southern Negroes.

Its thousands of teacher graduates have influenced many more thousands. Its most famous son, Booker T. Washington, who was admitted after successfully passing an entrance examination consisting of sweeping a floor, founded the famous Tuskeegee Institute, and was succeeded as its head by another Hampton graduate, Robert R. Moton.

A glance through notes of "graduates and ex-students" in *The Southern Workman,* monthly magazine published at the Institute, gives a cross-section of the type of work Hampton graduates are doing:

. . . elected to Kappa Delta Pi, international honor society in education . . . graduated from Medical College and elected member of Alpha Omega Alpha Honorary Medical Fraternity . . . practicing dentist in Suffolk, Va., and secretary of the Old Dominion Dental Society . . . Jeanes Supervisor of education for Accomac County (Va.) . . . librarian at Virginia Union University . . . dean of college of dentistry (Howard University) . . . automobile mechanic and painter in Springfield, Mass., also taking university extension course . . . worker for Philadelphia (Pa.) County Relief Board . . . executive secretary of Y. W. C. A. in Seattle, Wash., now teaching foods and household administration under C. W. A. . . . principal of elementary school . . . teaching mathematics and science in high school . . . teaching social studies in high school . . . teacher of science and mathematics and director of athletics in high school . . . editor of *Chicago Defender,* prominent Negro newspaper . . . teaching steamfitting and plumbing in trade school . . . nurse with 640 square miles to cover, teaching six groups of midwives as part of her work . . . sergeant of detectives . . . Power Maintainer of the Power Division of the Eighth Avenue Subway System, New York City . . . mortician, also 2nd Lieutenant National Guard . . . supervising teacher of county . . . one of few colored fliers in this part of the country . . . and on and on.

Not only are the graduates filling important positions, but also devoting their energies toward racial improvement in many ways. The following quotation from "graduates and ex-students" will illustrate: " . . . pointed out the work of Mrs. Julia Wrenn Partner (Hampton graduate) . . . and showed the Richmond (Ind.) Center to have been among the first thirty communities in which organized work was done to provide recreation for the Negro citizens."

Hampton itself is an important factor in the improvement of race relations. At the school, white and colored teachers and colored students meet in perfect freedom and equality. Whites in their domain may exclude Negroes, but at Hampton the Negroes do not exclude the whites. Their excellent library is open to all, and entertainments in the auditorium, consisting of motion pictures, plays and outstanding events are open to the public, in spite of a Virginia law which forbids whites and Negroes to sit in public meeting halls together. (This difficulty is circumvented by making all the affairs "private," and there is a notice at the entrance of the auditorium announcing that admission is by invitation only, and informing visitors where to secure invitations—but no one pays attention to this formality.) Many white persons from the nearby community came recently to attend a performance of the "Ballet Russe" which appeared at no other point in the vicinity.

Prohibition of dancing of whites and Negroes on the same floor is the school's one bow to existing conditions, and there is opposition to even this. The wife of one of the white professors told me that if she were asked to dance she would, regardless of consequences.

Then, too, Hampton coöperates fully with all organizations concerned with interracial activities—the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Urban League, the Interracial Commission, the Negro Business Men's League, Christian Associations, schools and churches. The activities and work of Hampton graduates in improving relations between Negro and white people are notable.

The education of Negroes and the raising of their standard of living is as important to the whites as it is to the Negroes. Commercially, the Negro market is the greatest undeveloped market in this country, and it is to the advantage of whites to see that this market is made accessible by aiding the Negro to improve his economic condition. And unless the Negro is given an opportunity to obtain economic security along with the whites, he will be taken care of by taxation, on unemployment and relief rolls, or in prisons.

More important still, to a country which calls itself Christian and democratic, terms in their deepest significance implying complete equality of *all* men in *all* ways, is the discrimination which is almost universal in America against one tenth of our people, the Negroes, and which constitutes a stronger challenge, in my opinion, than the addition of justices to a court or the refusal of workers to evacuate company property. As Arthur Howe, president of Hampton, said in a recent address, "Statistics of unemployment, relief rolls, allotment of public funds in states where bi-racial services are maintained, all tell the same story. Discriminations, North and South, in courts, at the polls, in business, residence, hotels, theatres, hospitals, and so forth are all too familiar." That these things should exist is a stain on the name Christian and the word democracy.

In view of these known facts and expressed beliefs, it seems to me that Hampton Institute and all those connected with her deserve a place of high honor in the list of makers of the nation we hope some day to realize.

**THE NEXT NUMBER OF**

**UNITY**

**will be a special issue on Religion and Social Justice published in cooperation with**

**The Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice**

# Are We Becoming Less Humane?

FREDERIC JAMES DENNIS

While war is raging in China and in Spain, humanitarians, whether professing Christians or not, have been asking themselves whether warfare is becoming less or more humane, less or more brutal. For as science and invention through the years have given us tools to advance our so-called "civilization"—especially in the saving of human life—so the same instrumentalities have changed and enlarged the methods of warfare. Each recurring war has produced new agencies or perfected old ones for the destruction and incapacitating of man by man. In the World War new instruments included the war plane and tank. In the Middle Ages and earlier, Greek Fire, ancestor of gunpowder, incendiary and gas bombs, and liquid fire (*flammenwerfen*), was the new and sensational weapon; gunpowder was the most revolutionary and startling innovation, beginning with the fourteenth century. To compare ethics and standards of early days with today will give us an indication of the trend.

Greek Fire, also called wild fire, sea fire, wet fire and liquid fire, was sensational because of the mystery of its nature, the sudden and alarming way it spread, the difficulty of extinguishing it, the dense smoke, and the panic it caused. The Christian world had its first contact with this new agency in 1097 when the Crusaders, at the siege of Nice, were subjected to attack by the Saracens, who threw flaming balls of pitch, oil, and fat against them. Different formulas have been given of the composition of the mixture, and authorities disagree as to its exact ingredients.

The use of Greek Fire is of ancient origin, for it is illustrated by Assyrian bas-reliefs at the British Museum. Aeneas, about 350 B. C., gave an inflammable formula which contained sulphur, pitch, incense, and pine wood. About six hundred years later, in 323 A. D., the Emperor Constantine wrote of Greek Fire to his son, and admonished him to keep the recipe a secret, adding, somewhat cynically, that the formula had been revealed to him by an angel! (The Church of the present day, though not actually inventing such diabolic mixtures, seems, alas, to condone the increasing horrors of warfare.) Colonel Hines, an authority on early methods of warfare, draws a distinction between "sea fire" and "wild fire":

> "When the Crusades began in 1097, the Greeks had two kinds of inflammable mixtures, (1) sea fire, which was the real Greek Fire; (2) the mixture of Aeneas, which was known all over the East. But the Crusaders called the latter Greek Fire. The true Greek Fire, sea fire, was thrown or poured on the sea; while wild fire (called Greek Fire by the Crusaders) was flung into the sky to drop thence on the heads of the enemy. Sea fire was not used after 1200."

The Arabs, who were noted for their knowledge of chemistry, or, as it was then called, alchemy, in the fifteenth century used a mixture in four ways: (1) thrown by hand, as in modern hand grenades; (2) affixed to "staves" or poles; (3) poured through tubes like the *flammenwerfen* of the world war; and (4) shot by means of missiles, such as javelins, arrows, or engines of war, such as ballistas.

Harold Lamb, an authority on the Crusades, described Greek Fire as "flaming oil, sea fire, and liquid fire." Mangonels (engines which operated like large slings) and ballistas threw mixtures contained in clay vessels and pots. This produced sudden rushing flames and dense smoke. The most dreaded form contained naphtha and other chemicals. On pyrophores, or fire-bearing ships, the prowhead was a metal lion's head or dragon or serpent, with open jaws, inside of which was a movable metal tube. A hose was connected with the end of the tube, and the liquid was squirted or pumped through the tube. The muzzle contained burning material which ignited the oil as it was poured down on enemy ships. A description of its behavior states, "A soldier on whose head was broken a firemace became suddenly soaked with the diabolic fluid which covered him from head to foot with flames." The English called Greek Fire "wild fire" whence originated the expression, "spread like wild fire." Thus we find two interesting facts: First, the terrifying liquid fire used in the World War, and new to that generation, was in reality a modern adaptation of the old Greek Fire. Secondly, hand grenades or bombs, incendiary and otherwise, now proving so successful, dropped by airplanes in Spain and China—setting fire to cities, killing and injuring men, women and children indiscriminately—are also direct descendants of early methods of warfare. The great and significant difference, that should startle present-day students of history, humanitarians, whether of the church or otherwise, is that in former ages these weapons were directed primarily against armies, whereas today whole populations are the helpless objectives. A comparison of opinions of early times on methods of warfare with what is apparently condoned now is also of interest.

How was Greek Fire, this novel method of warfare, regarded in early times, especially by Christian nations? The historians Renaud and Fave wrote: "The prejudices of ignorance were joined to religious and chivalrous ideas in rejecting the use of an agency that seemed to render useless attributes of individual courage and force." Hewitt comments that the use of Greek Fire was considered "contrary to the spirit of religion and the nobleness of chivalry." Michaud, another authority on the Crusades, stated: "The Crusaders always evinced great surprise at witnessing the explosion of Greek Fire. But what appears very strange, they never seemed to envy the Saracens this great advantage." The Saracens used Greek Fire in 1250 at Damietta, although the Christians still would not employ it.

Another contrast between war ethics of our day and that of less "civilized" times, the seventeenth century, is furnished by quotations from a book of Francis Markham, who wrote in 1622. He admonished warring forces to

> "Raze no Temples, deface no Monuments, nor defile Virgins: hold that Maxime amongst the Souldiers for a Paradox, which affirms, That when man enter by assault it is lawful to use all manner of outrage and violence. . . . Bridges may bee broken, passages barrocaded, men may become Spies, and the ayre it self, may be made unwholesome."

(Probably an early reference to poison gas.) Also,

"as to this life of a Souldier doth belong all the miseries that can be conceived: so to the same must bee fixt as an Armour, the greatest Patience that ever was professed: so shall our Souldiers bee victorious every way, and all the vices of Basenesse, Rashnesse, Murthur, Robbery, Ravishment, Folly, Riot, Deceit, Pride and Covetousnesse, which like so many infections lurke about Armies, shall as disperst clouds flie from his presence, and leave him to the world beloved and admired." And this from a leading exponent of war of that day, an authority on the subject!

The humanitarian of today may well ask himself how these standards of former times compare with methods now practised and condoned. What of the armies in Asia and Europe who do not hesitate to destroy noncombatants indiscriminately, including women and children! What of their ruthless destruction of "temples" and "monuments"!

The most revolutionary of all inventions of warfare was gunpowder. Some authorities maintain that it was introduced into Europe by the German monk, Berthhold, from China about 1380. But Oman says that the discovery of gunpowder was mistakenly credited to the Chinese, Arabs and Hindus. The Chinese, it is true, used incendiary compounds before the tenth century, but there is no indication that they used explosives. He further states that the actual person who first used gunpowder to drive a ball out of a cannon is still unknown. However that may be, it is agreed that the famous scholar, a Franciscan monk, Roger Bacon, knew about gunpowder and introduced it to the European world. He gave the first formula for the mixture of 100 parts, saltpetre 41.2; charcoal 29.4; sulphur 29.4. In Bacon's *Opus Majus,* almost an encyclopedia of mediaeval knowledge, written 1266-68, a rare book at the Henry E. Huntington Library in San Marino, California, is found, astonishingly, references to both liquid fire and gunpowder:

> "For malta, which is a kind of bitumen, and is plentiful in this world, when cast upon an armed man burns him up. The Romans suffered severe loss of life from this in their conquests, as Pliny states . . . similarly yellow petroleum, that is, oil springing from the rock, burns up whatever it meets if it is properly prepared. For a consuming fire is produced by this which can be extinguished with difficulty; for water cannot put it out. . . . Gideon is thought to have employed inventions similar to these in the camp of the Midianites. . . . From the force of the salt called saltpeter so horrible a sound is produced at the bursting of so small a thing, namely a small piece of parchment [a firecracker?], that we perceive it exceeds the roar of sharp thunder, and the flash exceeds the greatest brilliancy of the lightning accompanying the thunder."

But Roger Bacon thought only of gunpowder in connection with fireworks to frighten the enemy. It may seem strange that gunpowder, destroyer of mankind, should have been evolved under the very wing of the Church, by one of its monks. But, when it is realized that world knowledge was kept alive through the Dark Ages by the only persons who had the leisure, protection, or opportunity to study and experiment—the scholars and scientists of the time, the monks in their sacred monasteries—a ready explanation for that odd situation is found.

Another interesting aspect of the question is that presented by the historian, Henry Thomas Buckle, in his study of civilization. He, too, conceded that the discovery of gunpowder created a great change in the whole method of warfare, for prior to the fourteenth century every man was a soldier, whose duty it was to serve without question king and native land. Each man owned his own sword and bow, often inherited from his father. When gunpowder came into general use there now entered into the paraphernalia of war the new elements of greatly increased complexity and expense. Powder was expensive and difficult to produce, and so was cannon. For that reason, it was found more practical to leave the actual fighting to a relatively small trained army of professional soldiers. Other citizens thus relieved from duty with the armed forces could then turn to various peaceful pursuits. The average European, instead of being entirely occupied, as heretofore, with either War or the Church, could follow agriculture and the arts.

If the discovery of powder, in decreasing the size of armies, was considered a step towards peace, it follows that universal conscription and large armies, such as now obtain, notably in Italy and Germany, are steps towards war. The conducting of wars becomes more deadly and cruel, not only against the uniformed forces, but also against defenseless non-combatants, the women and children. The ethics of war have reached the lowest ebb in centuries. How can anyone consider that civilization has made warfare more humane?

---

# Harlan Coal Miner

**DON WEST**

Fall time allus is right purty. Sour-wood and sassafras speckle the mountains like a pieded heifer. Look sort of like wild fire blazes without smoke. Dry gullies are wet again. Creek beds are full up. Folks must take to foot-logs now, or doddle across a bridge swung to sycamore saplings. Simmons are ripe. 'Possums fat. Hound dogs turn their noes up and sniff the air.

Reminds me of times back yonder—fodder pullings, corn shuckings and stomp-downs. That was way back yon side of these days. Yon side of coal mines, railroads, and what folks call civilization. . . .

Fall time is purty. Winter is right purty, too. I used to think winter was just night time for the earth. I imagined she pulled off her clothes and slept down under the snow. Seemed just like a man, tired from a day between the plow handles. Sometimes I thought the naked trees looked like the skeletons of the beauty we saw in summer. The limbs reminded me of the finger bones we plowed up on Lame Shoat Ridge once.

I loved the white birch and sycamores that grabbed onto the banks of the Cumberland. Sometimes I thought winter was just a grey old man stroking his beard with bony white fingers. I loved it.

That was way back yonder. That was when we sang the old song ballets, or when we all heaved together at a log rolling. Seems like a mighty long time. Way back yon side of thirty years.

I counted the fogs this August. I watched them

gather in the great Cumberland Valley. They bunch up and float like a little cloud to the rim of Big Pine Mountain. I know just how many there were. Folks say there'll be a biting snow in the winter for every fog in August. Snows don't pleasure me no more.

Been way back since I loved fall time. Long time since the pieded mountains made something deep in me stir. Since then I've gone down to the mines. I've clawed under the mountains with my own hands. I've worn out thirteen picks and twenty-one shovels.

But I felt proud. For a long time I could load as much coal as any man. Every day before sun-up I went under the hills. For twenty-six years my days were spent there. My light was the sputtering blaze of a carbide lamp. Sight reached to the glistening sides of a coal-lined room, or a few feet down a jagged entry. . . .

Twenty-six years—staggering through darkness, and worse than darkness. Skint knuckles. Bruises. Sprains. Sweat, black damp mixture of coal dust. Dark-circled eyes. Coal in the skin. Marks a miner just like we used to mark yearlin's and shoats to turn on the mast. . . .

Twenty-six years—loading ten tons of hard diamond every day. Eyes strained for horse-backs—kettle-bottoms. Fear in a hot mine. Explosion! Fifty-five miners fetched out—dead! Numbing wail of wives and kids. Burying grounds and preachers droaning above the sorrow. . . .

Twenty-six years—shacks stuck on four pegs, or hinged to a hill like goiters on an old woman's neck. . . . Painful sight of privies row on row. Puny looking kids playing on cinder dumps, or wagging littler ones on the hip. A passel of them. Miners allus have a heap of kids. Got to be miners after us. The world needs heat and coal. It's willing to pay. . . .

Pay? Yes, I was paid. I made enough one week to pay for the rations we used the week before. Should a man ask more? Shouldn't every American be contented with that? That's what I've heard. There's too much discontent in America already. I heard a preacher say that. And isn't he right? I was paid for my work. I was paid for all the thousands of tons I dug. When the slate caught me that time it broke a hip. They said I was unable to work again. It did hurt an awful lot. But I thought I was better off than the brother who lost a whole arm. I thought I was luckier than Aleck Thacker who got both legs mashed off. And what about the fifty-five who were smothered without a chance to offer up a prayer?

I was lucky! Of course, I shouldn't expect to work any more when I was disabled. It was fair that I move out of the house. Some strong miner could live there. He would take my place down in the mines.

I moved out of the coal camp house. It was of my own free will. Don't all Americans move of their own free will? The Company was awful nice. It had the doctor attend me. Of course, I'd paid hospital fees for years. But that was a form of insurance against getting mashed up in the mines. The Company let me stay in the house plum up till I was able to hobble around on crutches. That was mighty nice.

When I moved it seemed like all the houses were full. There were some empty ones in the coal camps. But I couldn't mine coal. I had no right in those houses. I couldn't pay rent there anyhow. Looked like I didn't have no right in any house. I was thankful and satisfied, though. I'd heard preachers say the Lord would provide. He did. After camping around under the trees a few weeks, I finally ran right smack into the nicest rock cliff! Seemed like it just waited there for us to move under. The big rocks stuck away out over the road. It was hollowed out several feet back. It looks just as good as the cliff we used to shelter our hogs and cattle under.

We moved the six younguns in. I hunted some old slabs and bark to stand slant-wise. That kept part of the elements out. We raked up a passel of leaves to sleep on. We've been living here ever since. It costs no rent. Nobody has asked us to move. Isn't it lucky that we can live here without paying rent? This is my home now. I feel just like I own it.

The reason I count the fogs in August now is worry of the winter snows. Last winter was tough. Kids got awful cold. I have no job. Wife washes for a little money. I cut kindling wood from brush tops. Kids have no clothes. That's why fall time is not beautiful to me no more. It's why I hate winter. I know I oughtn't to, maybe. It's wrong for me to hate what the Lord has ordained. Maybe I'm a sinful man.

Sometimes bad moods come on now. Seems like they come oftener and stay longer these days. I get a lot of bad feelings about matters. I feel maybe like something is wrong. Seems sort of like the preachers and Jesus don't understand each other. Seems like Jesus had quare notions, too. It makes me curious the way he whipped the money swindlers and drove them out of the Temple. Of course, that was way long time ago. It wasn't in Kentucky, either. I try to explain it that way. Jesus spoke mighty sharp words about the big old hump-backed camel going through a tiny needle's eye. But he didn't know about the Kentucky coal operators who build whole church houses in every coal camp. They are firm believers. They pay the preachers. It may be checked off the miner's pay, of course. But the Company is responsible.

It's got me all worried. The kids are aggravating, too. Their bodies are covered with sores. They don't sleep well. Keep on waking me at night. Their feet are all cracked open. They cry. I never did like to hear kids cry that way. Seems like they just can't keep from crying when they get hungry. Looks like they'd get used to that after a while. This seems like enough to worry a man.

Yes, I was paid. . . . One week I made enough to pay for rations the week before. Should a man ask more? I hate to think Jesus was wrong. . . . Sometimes I think maybe America and the coal operators are wrong. But America is full of churches. The operators build churches and put pictures of Jesus in the windows. They pay the preachers, too.

Guess I'm just muddled up. . . . Maybe Jesus was wrong after all. Everybody knows a camel can't go through a needle's eye anyhow!

### Correction

In the article on "The Japanese and Militarism," by Walter B. Bullen, in issue of September 20, page 23, the sentence

> In consenting to war with China, in violation of a treaty in force for a decade, Itō made the capital bunder of his career.

should read as follows:

> In consenting to war when China, in violation of a treaty in force for a decade, despatched some troops to Korea, Itō made the capital blunder of his career.

# The Law, the Treaties, and the Wars!

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

[This is the third of a series of articles on Neutrality and the present war-crisis.]

The President has—at last—(on September 18) taken a hesitating and half-way measure in response to wide public demand to curtail the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to Japan and China, now at war in fact, if not in name. He has prohibited the carriage of primary contraband to the belligerents in vessels owned or controlled by the Government, its Shipping Board, or Maritime Commission, or Navy. He has announced that private merchant ships will transport such commodities to the Far Eastern belligerents at their own risk. What does that mean and where is the authority of law for such action?

No such action was authorized by the famous Neutrality Acts of the past three years or by any other law so far as this writer knows, although the President announced the same principle with regard to the Italian war against Ethiopia in 1935. The Neutrality Act proscribes and makes unlawful all exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents, without exception. The President has not enforced the law. Instead, he has modified it, for reasons that are neither clear nor convincing. Previous embargo legislation in the United States gave the President discretion to apply restraint against the exportation of absolute contraband of war to Latin-American countries disturbed by "conditions of domestic violence" which might, in the President's opinion, be aided or increased by arms transported from American territory. This legislation was extended to include countries in which the United States exercises what is called extra-territorial jurisdiction,—and China is one of these. But the present conflict in China is emphatically not one of "domestic violence." It is international war, of the most terrible kind. The President's equivocal action, therefore, falls far short both of the terms of our mandatory law and of the crying demands of constructive statesmanship—with regard to Spain as well as China.

What is the law? We have already discussed its major provisions in a preceding article. Not, however, the second clause of Section 1, of the Neutrality Act ot 1937, approved by the President himself on May 1, which reads as follows:

> The President shall, from time to time, by proclamation extend such embargo (as that called for in clause A) upon the export of arms, ammunition, or implements of war to other States as and when they may become involved in such war.

Whatever this means, it is clearly not "discretionary." Has not Italy, by the public admissions of its own governors and generals and controlled newspapers, admitted that its government has become involved in, and is actively assisting, the abominable domestic conflict in distracted Spain? And did not the Japanese naval commander at Shanghai, and Viscount Ishii himself, in a special broadcast from Tokyo to the American people, on the evening of September 21st last, plainly declare that Japan is waging public war in China against the Chinese Government and people, in retaliation for alleged injuries? These are disruptive and damning facts, of which every intelligent person save the President of the United States, perhaps, is painfully aware; and the awareness is debasing the moral currency of the American Government. Why does the Chief Executive venture to nullify or modify the law, so recently and emphatically enacted? Why does he not, in manfully enforcing it, call upon the peoples of Britain and France and Holland, and of Scandinavia and Czecho-Slovakia, and the Governments of Germany and Italy, whence the arms come, to join him in enforcing similar measures of law and sanction again outrageous wars, in the name of honest neutrality and the peace of civilization? Let us ask the President and his State Department—but ask the Chambers of Commerce first!

And what of the treaties to which the United States is signatory?

Both the international treaties concerning China and insular possessions in the Pacific, which were concluded at Washington under American auspices, fifteen years ago, and the new Neutrality Act call for constructive action—both joint and separate—against the menace and the actual perpetration of predatory war in that area, whether declared and admitted to be such, or not. If the principal war-maker will not honorably declare his reasoned intentions, as required by the Hague Convention to do, the President of the United States is now under the legal obligation to recognize and proclaim the fact, the fact also of violation of the Kellogg-Briand Pact; and to impose a series of penalties which Congress has expressly provided, and which are clearly intended to be not merely measures to safeguard the peace and security of the American people, but also measures giving force and "implementation" to the terms and pledges of that famous Pact.

This was not the case in the stressful and hypocritical period preceding American participation in the World War. Thereby hangs the measure of our progress as a people toward self-discipline and economic understanding and control, which are part of the price of peace between men and nations. So much for the new neutrality, which now has an opportunity to demonstrate its validity as a contribution to international law as well as national welfare—if the President will enforce the law!

And what of the Pacific treaties, to which we are a party, and which are still "in force," never having been denounced? By their spirit and implications, if not by their letter, they call for joint political action by the principal powers having interests in China and the Far East.

There is no incompatibility or contradiction between the terms of the treaties and the spirit and purpose of the Neutrality Act, as some persons have alleged. On the contrary, they are complementary. The treaties call for conference, for frankness, and for diplomatic coöperation between their signatories; but there is nothing whatever in them that calls for the determination of "the aggressor" in the Far East, by the United States Government or any other signatory, contrary to what many Chinese students and sentimental friends of China in this country appear to believe. There is, however, authority in them for coöperative action by the Powers, looking to removal of the cause of the conflict—a very different matter.

The moralistic, or legalistic approach—the attempt by political authority to stigmatize the guilty or aggressive party, and intimidate him, is a step leading directly towards war. Consultation, looking towards removal of the causes of conflict without any obligation or implication of coercion or violence against even the apparent aggressor, looks in the opposite direction. Herein lies the important difference between the American and the European approach to peace.

What precisely do the treaties concerning the Pacific say? It is important to know what we are talking about. The first treaty is known as the Four Power Pact, and was concluded at Washington, Dec. 13, 1922, by the representatives of the United States, the British Empire, France, and Japan. (It was ratified, and subsequently proclaimed on Aug. 17, 1923; it came into force, therefore, exactly fourteen years ago.)

Its preamble reads: "With a view to the preservation of the general peace, and the maintenance of their rights in relation to their insular possessions and dominions in the region of the Pacific—" Its terms are brief and reasonably clear. The high contracting parties agree that

> "If there should develop between any of them a controversy arising out of any Pacific question, and involving their rights, which is not satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, and is likely to affect the harmonious accord now happily subsisting between them" they shall "invite the other Parties to a joint conference to which the whole subject will be referred for consideration and adjustment."

Who shall invite the others? . . . The treaty is discreetly silent as to that. Presumably, the power most directly concerned or gravely threatened. That might be supposed to be China. But China was not a party to this treaty; and the present controversy is not between the actual signatories, at least not yet.

Article 2 of the Four Power Pact reads:

> "If the said rights are threatened by the aggressive action of any other power, the parties shall communicate with one another fully and frankly, in order to arrive at an understanding as to the most efficient measures to be taken, jointly or separately, to meet the exigencies of the particular situation."

Obviously, what these four powers then appeared to have in mind was the possibility of "aggressive action" from the direction of Moscow, not Tokyo! All in all, it is doubtful, therefore, whether the Four Power Pact has, or can have, any application to the exigencies of this particular situation. That is the first point.

The second, and even more important, point to observe is that when the Senate consented to the ratification of this interesting treaty, it attached an important reservation, of only one sentence in length. It read: "The United States understands that under the statement in the Preamble, or under the terms of this treaty, *there is no commitment to (the use of) armed force, no alliance, no obligation to join in any defense.*"

The Treaty was signed by Charles Evans Hughes, Senators Lodge and Underwood, and Mr. Root for the United States; but the reservation was attached principally by the apprehension and initiative of Senators Brandegee and Borah.

There was, however, a second and more comprehensive treaty concluded at about the same time. This is known as the "Nine Power Pact" of the "International Treaty for the Pacific." In addition to the "Big Four" powers, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, Portugal, and China signed this treaty, declaring their desire "to adopt a policy designed to stabilize conditions in the Far East, to safeguard the rights and interests of China; and to promote intercourse between China and the other Powers upon the basis of equality of opportunity." In other words, the "Open Door."

The contracting powers (other than China) agreed: (1) to respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China; (2) to provide the fullest and most unembarrassed opportunity to China to develop and maintain an effective and stable government; (3) to use their influence for the purpose of effectually establishing and maintaining the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations throughout the territory of China; and (4) to refrain from taking advantage of conditions in China, in order to seek special rights or privileges . . . and from countenancing actions inimical to the security of friendly States."

Article 2 further states that the Powers agree "not to enter into any treaty, arrangement, or understanding with any Power which would infringe or impair these principles"; and Article 4, "not to support any private agreements designed to create Spheres of Influence" in China.

Japan apparently is violating the first, third, and fourth clauses of Article I of the treaty, and perhaps Article 4, as well as the Kellogg Pact; which is the most important matter. At least the Japanese Navy has perpetrated outrageous acts of war within Chinese territories and her most populous cities. Why, then, do not the signatories of this Nine Power Treaty do something?

Article 7 reads: "The Contracting Parties agree that, whenever a situation arises which, in the opinion of any one of them, involves the application of the stipulations of the present treaty, and renders desirable discussion of such application, there shall be full and frank communication between the Powers concerned."

"Communication" is decidedly Platonic; neither joint action nor coercion, nor any question of pointing an accusing international finger at the "aggressor" is even implied.

The Chinese students, therefore, who have recently appealed to the President by telegram to denounce Japan as the aggressor against their country are misinformed as to the character of the obligations assumed by the United States in these Pacific treaties; and they may mislead their friends concerning them, and concerning our historic and carefully considered neutrality policy.

It may be presumed that important diplomatic interchanges are now taking place between the Department of State and the foreign offices of Britain, France, and other governments; if they were not there would be an incredible dereliction of duty.

It is important to observe, however, that no word in these treaties obligates the United States to take any unseconded initiative in this matter; that our material and political interests in China are far less in extent, or value, than those of Britain or France, howsoever great our human and sentimental, scientific and religious interests have grown.

There are moral reasons and justifications for doing so, despite China's lamentable shortcomings, inertias, and corruptibilities. But the striking failure of the League of Nations, and of the British government, effectively to coöperate with the United States Government at the time of the Japanese Army's first outrageous attack upon Chapei and Manchuria, five years ago, cannot be forgotten. That action, or non-action, led,

indeed, directly to the decline and disintegration of the League of Nations as a moral and political instrumentality of "the international community."

It is, therefore, to the "sanctity of treaties" and to the good faith of their signatories, in the case of the Nine Power Pact—not to the League—that China must look for whatever protection which, in her weakness, she can hope for.

As the sponsor of the Washington Conference in 1921, from which that treaty emerged, and of the Kellogg Pact, which has been so cynically ignored and flouted by the Japanese and other militarists, and as the initiator of the new neutrality with its penalties against belligerents, as such, the United States Government has more than sufficient provocation (not to mention the murder of three or more of its most respected citizens in Shanghai) to take an important international diplomatic initiative now, in an endeavor to do what the managers of the League of Nations have so long and so vainly talked about doing—to demonstrate the beneficent power of a loyal endeavor to fulfill the basic obligations of the world community and the promise of the Kellogg Pact, without taking violent and improper side in a complex controversy, whose deeper causes and issues do not meet the eye.

It is not Japan, but militarism, economic imperialism, population pressure, poverty and the old international anarchy which are the cause of the present tragedy in China—as well as China's own weakness and wealth. The new American Neutrality Act is the best guide to provisional conduct in time of danger and of conflict that has ever been developed, for ourselves and others.

But the solution must be sought through loyal and constructive international collaboration for the vindication of the principles of justice. If, instead of provocative action against Japan, American opinion now demands a convocation of the powers signatory to the Nine Power Treaty, and suggests that, pending a final solution, all of them join with us in the application of the same series of penalties against belligerents—against belligerency as such—which the neutrality legislation calls for in a mandatory and impartial way, we venture to think that—if this were done, or even seriously proposed—the Japanese army and navy would be recalled so quickly from Shanghai and Chahar that the soldiers would hardly know which way they were marching!

And if this were followed by an anti-military revolution in Japan—the civilized world would look on with satisfaction, knowing that the triumph of civilian and democratic elements is the best guaranty of peace, in the Orient as in the Occident.

There is no better way to promote that emancipating revolution in behalf of civilian democracy in Japan, and peace in the Orient, than to apply the economic embargoes of the American Neutrality Act, to win the collaboration of other great industrial and neutral nations to do likewise, and thus, without taking improper sides in a complicated quarrel, to bring a potent and collective moral and economic pressure to bear, with stringent penalties, against the criminal conduct of illicit and atrocious war.

To the neutrals belongs the future and the preservation of peace—if they have the character and courage to coöperate in undermining and outgeneraling the Samurai! But have they? Ask President Roosevelt!

---

# Green Old Age

**R. S. KELLERMAN**

It is a long journey, speaking of religion, from the age of puberty to eighty years of man's life. As a general rule the promptings of religion come to youth when he is from twelve to fifteen years of age, if they ever come at all. And the history of religious experience is a long line of many kinks and tangles, broken strands, frazzled edges, shrunken, weakened and often broken entirely by the postulates and researches of science, the stages of world opinion, and the trend of civilization.

Observation seems to show that the brilliance of religion in youth gradually fades and diminishes through maturer age, so much so that at eighty it is well-nigh extinguished and lost. Religion follows, in reverse, the course of learning, science, and human government, not always, but generally. And still, attested by the earliest tradition and history that we possess, religion marked the beginning of human thought. Or perhaps it is better to say that the first inquiry that stirred the early mind of primitive man, so far as there is evidence, was in the realm of those emotions and thoughts which is termed religious.

Primitive man, in his early observation, when almost his sole occupation was his daily battle against the elements, reptiles, and animals of nature both in the water, on the land, and in the branches of the trees, perceived movement, action, events, appearance, and disappearance, and they stirred his mind into an inquiry as to the being, the power, the cause, of the many fluctuations taking place roundabout him, and his guess—it was nothing more than a guess—was that it was demons, spirits, gods. Man's first intellectual and emotional activities seem to have been concerned with the unseen and the unknown, with spirits good and bad, gods and divinities, all greater, higher and more powerful than himself.

Primitive man's first act of worship was sacrifice, gift, trade, bribe, that deity might be induced to be favorable to him, his family, and his kind, in their battle for existence. And this idea of sacrifice, giving up something, trading the dearest thing life possesses, for divine favor, sustenance and protection, is found in all religions and has gone down through the ages as a vital element in religion itself.

But not to miss the point—the point is that it was the challenge of unseen and unknown powers and intelligence thrusting themselves upon primitive man that quickened his mind into activity, set his wits over against the wits of the unseen powers and beings, that they might aid him in procuring food, providing shelter, and sustaining life. This

may have been the first step, a religious step, that led the mind of man on to its timeless, spaceless adventure in quest and conquest in widespread and diversified fields of truth, that conferred on him satisfaction and happiness. If there is not sufficient evidence to fully sustain this point, it is enough to say that all the evidence there is, in tradition and in the old bibles of the world, is in its favor and there is no other evidence.

And let it be said in addition that religion, particularly that part of religion which includes human thought and emotion toward the unknown and undiscoverable power and mind higher and beyond our own and man's relation to it, has played a larger part in human life and its advancement and has contributed more toward felicity and contentment than any other element or factor connected with the life of man. Mighty has been the power of religion in the making of the mind of man and of its impelling power in his career.

Now, if the ideal life or the near ideal, which we call by the name of the Green Old Age, be reached and a residence there be maintained, religion, naturally and of necessity, must be of its sustaining constituents. Not any one of the organized religions; not any special form of faith of any church or shrine; but the essence and the odor of spiritual faith in a guiding and sustaining Providence with whom we live in intimate relationship.

The "beyond" is one of the islands withheld from human sight and penetration. The schools and colleges teach nothing of it. The researches of science have not touched its hidden shores. Neither philosophy nor reason, reflection nor industry reveals anything of it. Only the eye of faith has discovered and explored it. Faith is native with the human mind, an inheritance with birth, an aptitude, a property, an original conviction, perhaps a talent or a faculty. Faith of itself is not necessarily an adherence to objective things or events, places or conditions; but it is a satisfying peace of mind both as to the past and present and an unshaken assurance of justice and mercy in the future. Faith makes the grass grow green whereon the feet of age may tread with satisfaction and contentment.

---

# The Study Table

### Dictators Old and New

THE STORY OF DICTATORSHIP. *By E. E. Kellett. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. $1.75.*

Dr. Kellett is an excellent scholar, but he has not done a very good job in this book. This is a pity, for the subject is timely and important. We should have had this story before, and must have it again in more thoroughgoing form.

The author begins his work with ancient Israel, and tells the tale of Abimelech as typical of the tyrants of that time and place. The Greek tyrannies, including those of Sicily, are presented in sketchy fashion, but peculiarly enough there is no account of the demagogues and despots of Rome. The narrative is taken right on to renaissance Italy. Napoleon is given an entire chapter as the representative dictator of all time. After an excursion into South America, the author brings us to the modern tyrannies of the Bolsheviks, the Fascists, the Nazis, and Dollfuss of Austria. For the latter Dr. Kellett has a sympathy which he has for neither Lenin, Stalin, Mussolini, nor Hitler. "I hesitate," he writes, "to call [this man] a tyrant, or even a dictator, though for two years he wielded dictatorial powers, and indeed assumed them with hardly the slightest show of legality. I would rather rank him with Cromwell, who . . . took power reluctantly." But a reading of the story of Dollfuss sounds strangely similar to all the rest.

Dr. Kellett's book is much more satisfactory in the closing than in the opening chapters. In his account of times before our own, he seems overwhelmed by the mass of material, and what he selects he handles loosely and vaguely. These historical accounts are too scrappy to be of any value. In the case of Mussolini and Hitler we have more extended treatment. One can pardon a good many faults for the sake of the story of the murder of Matteotti as here set down in unforgettable detail and with no dodging of Il Duce's responsibility for the crime. The story of the burning of the Reichstag is also told bluntly, with "Goebbels and his coadjutors" held up as the criminals in "a Catilinarian conspiracy." If these modern dictators were connected more definitely with their historical predecessors, and the common laws of their action more clearly analyzed, Dr. Kellett's book would be more satisfactory. But his philosophy does not go very deep, and we get no clear picture of what the author presents as a constantly recurring phenomenon. Nor does he tell us in any helpful way what we may do to rid the world of this besetting plague.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

❖ ❖ ❖

### A Question of Taste

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT. *By Ben Whitehurst. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.* $1.00.

This collection of letters received by President Roosevelt, gathered and edited by the former Chief of the Correspondence Division of the FERA and WPA, is meant to be funny. And it *is* funny! Many of the letters published in this little volume are of the hilarious variety.

But, as one turns the pages and laughs, perhaps reads to a group and gets them all howling, an uncomfortable question begins to intrude upon the mind and spoil the fun. What are we to think of a man who releases the private letters sent to him confidingly by hundreds of humble men and women, that their ignorance, simplicity, awkwardness, stupidity may be the occasion of very far from innocent merriment throughout the nation?

That President Roosevelt saw these pitiful letters we do not believe. That they were published without his permission we cannot believe. What this means as to the character of a man and the spirit of an administration is worth pondering.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

# Correspondence

### John Brown

Editor of UNITY:

John Brown may *never* "be dismissed as a bloodthirsty monomaniac," as your correspondent Mr. Anderson so glibly states.

Thoreau, after a talk with Brown, says: "He saw enough in war to disgust him with a military life—indeed to excite in him a great abhorrence of it. He resolved not to have anything to do with any war, unless it were a war for liberty."

He gladly gave his life to free four million human beings from bondage.

John Brown needs no defense from me until I see in print a statement such as Mr. Anderson makes.

John Brown's soul "goes marching on," and will continue to do so in the heart of every new generation just so long as liberty is allowed to be an ideal on the earth.

V. FRIEDERIKA VAN BUSKIRK.

*Roann, Indiana.*

---

### The War in Asia

Editor of UNITY:

I am moved to send a few words in reference to the struggle in Asia. Men are thinking and writing much as they did back in 1914-1917. They keep clear of what seems to me to be the real course for Americans to take. They should become more conscious of their own sins.

E. Stanley Jones, for example, has in the *Christian Century* an "Open Letter to the People of Japan." He speaks like an evangelist, not like a fellow-sinner, for the Anglo-Saxon has been not only a sinner like Japan, but has led the way from Gibraltar back to Gibraltar for many decades, and is doing it now.

Repentance should be the great word. And the Anglo-Saxon should be at the head of the procession of the penitent!

Boycotts and sermons for Japan are not for the Anglo-Saxons to hand out in the name of peace—to avert war.

The Anglo-Saxon who wishes to help in the Asiatic struggle should read the story of the two men who went up to the Temple, and make careful note of the "sinner" who was exalted. The boastful Pharisee has no message.

In our attitude toward Japan, the best thing we can do is openly to admit our sins.

Efforts to enforce neutrality laws, agitation for boycotts are ineffective even in their technique—besides they increase the war spirit and international anger.

The only way to cure the "war-insanity" of Japan is to possess a national penitence and forgiveness. We should take a square look at ourselves—remember our history, our treatment of Japan for the last quarter century, our lynchings, racial intolerance, our superiority complex, our wars of invasion, our civil wars—thus revealing a spirit of humility. There is nothing under the sun that would more quickly melt the heart of a proud people.

Wherever I go, I am offering this as the best and surest way of curing Japan of her "war insanity."

"When ye stand praying, forgive!" Not recite your neighbor's faults! Not seek to convert your neighbor! But, mindful of your own sins, FORGIVE! This way of Christ is the only way of peace!

SYDNEY STRONG.

*Seattle, Washington.*


***Attend!***

**THE HUMANIST SEMINAR**

**Niagara Falls, New York, October 23, 24, 25**

*FACULTY:*

**PROF. J. A. C. F. AUER, HARVARD UNIVERSITY**
**PROF. E. A. BURTT, CORNELL UNIVERSITY**
**MR. CORLISS LAMONT, NEW YORK CITY**

**LECTURES, followed by discussion:**

Oct. 23. 3:00 P. M. Professor Auer, **The Method of Humanism**
8:00 P. M. Professor Burtt, **The Historical Background of Humanism**

Oct. 24. 10:00 A. M. Professor Auer, **The Findings of Humanism**
3:00 P. M. Professor Burtt, **The Intellectual Foundations of Humanism**
8:00 P. M. Mr. Lamont, **The Social-Economic Implications of Humanism**

Oct. 25. 10:00 A. M. Professor Auer, **The Aim of Humanism**
12:15 P. M. Luncheon. Dean Curtis W. Reese, **Toward Organic Humanism**
3:00 P. M. Professor Burtt, **The Practical and Emotional Supports of Humanism**

HEADQUARTERS—The Prospect House, Niagara Falls. ROOMS, $2.00 per day.
Registration for the Seminar, $1.00. Auspices,

**THE HUMANIST PRESS ASSOCIATION**

**301 N. Mayfield Avenue, Chicago**

**Address, Edwin H. Wilson, Secretary**